

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of August 9, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. Nonetheless, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-7 and 9-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,173,250 to Jong (hereinafter Jong), in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0049389 to Marko, *et al.* (hereinafter Marko). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jong, in view of Marko, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,339,754 to Flanagan, *et al.* (hereinafter Flanagan).

Amendments to the Claims

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections in the Office Action, Applicants nonetheless have amended the claims in order to expedite prosecution of the present application by further emphasizing certain aspects of the claims. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that the claim amendments presented are not intended as, and should not be interpreted as, the surrender of any subject matter. Applicants are not conceding by these amendments that any previously submitted claims are unpatentable over the references of record. Applicants' present claim amendments are submitted only for purposes of facilitating the expeditious prosecution of the present Application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue any previously submitted claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

In this response, Applicants have amended the independent claims to emphasize certain aspects of the claims. In particular, the independent claims have been amended to explicitly recite that the alternative text message being sent to the called party is in the

same language as the speech input of the calling party. For example, as recited in Claim 1, the speech input is transcribed to a text message in the same language and the text message is converted to an alternative text message in a same language. Furthermore, amended Claims 10 and 15 and newly presented Claim 21 recite the limitations that along with an audio presentation of the alternative text, a translated version of the alternative text can also be present in substantially real-time on a display device at the called party's location. Claim 18 has been cancelled. All amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification, as discussed below. No new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Aspects of the Claims

It may be useful to discuss certain aspects of the Claims prior to discussing the cited references. The claims, as amended, recite systems and methods for providing voice-to-text reduction for real-time messaging. A method, as typified by Claim 1, can include the step of receiving a speech input from a calling party and transcribing the speech input to a text message in a same language as the speech input. The method can further include converting the text message to an alternative text message in a same language as the received text message. A profile of the calling party or the called party can be used to specify how to replace at least a portion of the text message with an alternative text portion having a same meaning, where the alternative text portion used is of a shorter length than the replaced portion of the original text message.

For example, as shown in FIG. 2 and the accompanying text, a message, "Hello,... What's going on?" can be received by a microphone 12 and processed by a speech-to-text system 22 that generates a transcribed message in the same language as the input speech (as shown by the voice portal 25 receiving "what's going on"). The transcribed message can be received by a voice portal 25, which replaces at least a part of the message with

text of shorter length and same meaning ("what's going one" = "wassup?"). The alternative text, including the replaced sections, can then be sent to the called party.

The method can also include performing data compression to compress the alternative text message prior to transmitting the alternative text message as a data stream defining a text stream and transmitting the text stream to a called party. (See, e.g., paragraph [0021].) Finally the method can include receiving the text stream by the called party and rendering the alternative text message for the called party in substantially real-time. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0007] and [0021].)

In some embodiments, as recited in Claims 10, 15, and 21, the presentation of text messages can include presentation by both audio and visual means. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0017]-[0018], extending chat session to provide text and speech output. In such embodiments, the alternative text message can additionally be translated into a second language and the transcribed alternative text can be displayed. (See, e.g., paragraph [0023].)

The Claims Define Over the Cited References

As previously noted, independent Claims 1, 11, and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jong in view of Marko. Jong discloses a system and method for speech-text-transmit communications over data networks, including speech recognition components and text-to-speech components. It is acknowledged at page 4 of the Office Action that Jong fails to disclose the compression of text messages prior to their transmission. Such a feature, though, is asserted in the Office Action to be disclosed in Marko. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Jong, alone or in combination with any other reference of record, fails to disclose each and every element of the claims, as amended.

In particular, Jong fails to disclose a system or method for converting the text messages, in which at least a portion of the text message is replaced with an alternative text having the same meaning but having a shorter length, into an alternative message in the same language as the input text message. Instead, Jong only discloses providing a translation of the text message into a different language. (See, e.g., Fig. 9 and accompanying text.) Although Jong does disclose translation of text messages into a second language – and the resulting message could be of a shorter length – the shorter message is in a second language, and not in the language of the input speech.

The claims explicitly recite converting input speech into alternative text messages in the same language by first transcribing in the same language and by replacing portions of the text message with portions having the same meaning, but a shorter length (i.e., reduced number of characters) so as to create an alternative message in the same language. For example, an original text message may state: "hello . . . what's going on?" According to the recited method, the portion "what's going on?" can be replaced with a single word "wassup?" This results in the alternative message with the same meaning, "hello . . . wassup?" In another example, the original text message may state "Where are you . . . it's time to go." According to the recited method, the portion "it's time to go" can be replaced, for example, with the phrase "let's bolt." This results in the alternative message with the same meaning, "Where are you? . . . let's bolt." In either example, the alternative text message comprises a text message requiring fewer characters than the original text message, yet is still in the same language as the original text message. Such a configuration is advantageous in that it allows an even smaller data stream to be transmitted.

However, in the Office Action, it is asserted the Specification does not support such a motivation. Applicants respectfully disagree. In the Specification, it is explicitly noted that two motivations for the invention are (1) low bandwidth environments and (2)

poor output capabilities. Applicants respectfully submit that the motivation for generating smaller messages is inherently supported by both of these motivations. First, overcoming bandwidth limitations can only be accomplished by reducing message size or compression. Second, output device limitations can only be altered by adjusting the message content. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the caller or callee would provide a profile suited to their device and their environment. That is, a callee knowing that he only has limited capabilities for displaying text or receiving messages in a network would use a profile to simplify the received text messages as much as possible, including through the replacement of text so as to reduce the message size. Similarly, a caller knowing a callee's limited capabilities to receive message, can use a profile to simplify sent text messages as much as possible, including the replacement of text to reduce the message size.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the use of profiles to generate shorter text messages is fully supported by the Specification. Such shorter messages, along with an appropriate compression technique, result in transmission of messages having a further reduced size without altering the meaning of the original text message. As a result, a lower transmission bandwidth is required, reducing transmission costs for transmitted text messages, and a simpler message is delivered to the callee, overcoming any output limitations.

Furthermore, Jong fails to disclose or suggest the transmission to the called party or the presentation to the called party of both the alternative message and a translated version of the alternative message. In Jong, either the message or the translated message is presented to the caller. Nowhere, does Jong disclose or suggest the transmission of two versions of any message. In contrast, Claims 10, 15, and 21 explicitly recite providing an audio version of the alternative message to the user and providing a

translated version visually as well. Such a configuration permits the user to hear messages and receive a real-time translation.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Jong, in combination with Marko or any other reference of record, fails to disclose each and every element of independent Claims 1, 11, and 19, as amended. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 11, and 19 define over the references of record. Furthermore, as the remaining dependent claims depend from one of Claims 1, 11, and 19, while reciting additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims likewise define over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: November 9, 2007

/Richard A. Hinson/
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Eduardo J. Quinones, Registration No. 58,575
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000